

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The examiner rejects claims 2, 3, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, alleging the claims failed to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. The examiner rejects claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Muramatsu (US Patent No. 5,452,108). The examiner objects to claims 2, 3 and 9 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants amend claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-18, and 20-23, and add claims 25-26. Claims 1-26 remain after entering this amendment. Applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thanks examiner Gibbs for allowing claims 1, 4-7 and 11-24.

### Specification Objections and Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The examiner rejects claims 2, 3, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, alleging the claims failed to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. The examiner objects to claims 2, 3 and 9 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants amend claims 1-3, and 8-9, which obviates the examiner's rejections.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The examiner rejects claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Muramatsu. Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejections.

Muramatsu discloses a scanning system 10 capable of scanning original sheets with a scanner 19. The scanning system 10 feeds the original sheets onto platen glass 18 for scanning and then activates a motor M2 that slides the scanner 19 along the original sheet while it scans. By concurrently activating both the scanner 19 and the motor M2, the scanning system 10 scans one side of the original sheet located on the platen glass 18 with one swipe of the scanner 19.

Claim 8 recites *scanning a first portion of a side of a document located in a first document position relative to a scanning window with a scanning head located in a first head position, moving the document to a second document position relative to the scanning*

window, and scanning a third portion of the side of the document with the document in the second position. The examiner alleges Muramatsu's scanner 19 discloses the recited scanning head. Muramatsu, however, does not teach or suggest the scanner 19 scanning a portion of one side of a document in a first position, and then moving the document to a second position, where the scanner 19 scans another portion on the same side of the document. See, Muramatsu, abstract; col. 3, lines 54-56; col. 9, lines 22-31, where the scanner 19 scans one entire side of an original sheet in one swipe while the original sheet feeding is halted in one position. Since there is no disclosure in Muramatsu of moving the document after scanning a portion of the document and then scanning another portion of the same side of the document after the document has been moved, Muramatsu does not anticipate claim 8 or its corresponding dependent claims.

### **New Claims**

Applicants add new claims 25 and 26, support for which is found in the specification as originally-filed. Claim 25 recites *scanning head remains stationary in the first head position while scanning the first portion of the side of the document and the scanning head remains stationary in the second head position while scanning the second portion of the side of the document*. The examiner appears to allege Muramatsu scanner 19 discloses the recited scanning head. There, however, is no disclosure in Muramatsu of the scanner 19 scanning at least a portion of an original sheet while stationary, nor after the scanner 19 has stopped moving as the claims require. See, Muramatsu, abstract; col. 3, lines 54-56; col. 9, lines 22-31, where the motor M2 for moving the scanner 19 begins rotating when an original sheet is to be scanned and is halted once the scanning process is completed. In other words, Muramatsu does not teach or suggest its scanner 19 scanning the recited documents while in a stationary position or after the scanner 19 has stopped moving. Muramatsu therefore does not anticipate claim 25.

Claim 26 includes features similar to those the examiner found allowable with regard to claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 20, and therefore are allowable for similar reasons.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 871-7739 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/ Jeffrey J. Richmond /

---

Jeffrey J. Richmond  
Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP  
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600  
Portland, Oregon 97205

**Customer No. 73552**